

**STATEMENT BY
ROBERT M. GATES
BEFORE THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE
HEARING ON THE
NOMINATION AS DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
APRIL 10, 1986**

Mr. Chairman, members of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today on my nomination as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

- I am honored by the President's decision to nominate me.
- I am grateful to Director Casey for his confidence in me, the opportunities he has given me and his unwavering support.
- I am honored to follow in the footsteps of two respected colleagues and friends, Bob Inman and John McMahon, both of whom were esteemed for their sound judgment, managerial skill and independence of view. I cannot think of two finer role models for a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

I believe it would be useful and appropriate for me to speak at the outset to the oversight process. I have addressed this in writing in response to a question from the Committee, but believe it would be worthwhile to summarize my views.

Every so often, the assertion is made that U.S. intelligence, and CIA in particular, deeply dislikes oversight, resists keeping the Committees informed, carries out its reporting responsibilities grudgingly and minimally, and would like to return to the so-called "good old days" before Oversight.

This public hearing affords me the opportunity to say that these allegations are wrong. The concept and principles of Congressional oversight of Intelligence are fully accepted within the American Intelligence Community. Nearly two-thirds of those now serving in CIA began their careers after 1976, when oversight as we know it today began. They know no other way of doing business than within the framework of Congressional oversight. At the same time, we realize that, almost by definition, oversight involves skepticism, criticism, and suggestions for improvement. And, obviously, no one likes to be on the receiving end of criticism. But, whatever frictions result are usually transitory and do not affect the basic process.

More important, the Community's acceptance of oversight is based in substantial measure on recognition of the benefits to us of the process. We know, for example, that the rebuilding of American intelligence began in 1979 with this Committee. Subsequently, both Committees have strongly supported our resource needs. You have on occasion given us public protection against unjustified accusations. Oversight has created an environment that fosters adherence to the rules at all levels and discourages corner cutting or abuses. The Committees have contributed to improving the quality of our work and to efficiency. And, finally, the Congressional Committees and Executive oversight organizations such as the Intelligence Oversight Board and President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board should give Americans confidence that their intelligence service is accountable, carries out its activities according to the law and that we are guided by standards and values acceptable to them.

The relationship between the Congressional oversight committees and the Intelligence Community is unique in the world -- the first attempt ever to conduct secret intelligence operations accountable to the people and responsive to the law and to the Congress. While the oversight process may occasionally lead to frictions in the gray area resulting from the overlap between Congressional authorities and the duties of the Executive, it has been the practice of both branches of government for ten years now to try to resolve such difficulties in a spirit of comity and mutual understanding. This unique relationship between us depends on mutual trust, candor and respect and I assure you I intend to conduct myself with this in mind.

Twenty years have elapsed since I began my intelligence career as an Air Force Intelligence Officer in a Minuteman Missile Wing. You have before you the details of my career which I will not repeat. There are three features, however, worth highlighting:

- First, I have always believed that no matter how good American intelligence is -- and it is, in my view, quite good -- it can always be improved. I presumptuously first expressed dissatisfaction with and suggested improvements in our analytical work on the Soviet Union in a Studies in Intelligence article published a short time after I joined the Agency. Throughout my career, culminating in my present position, I have endeavored to improve the quality of our work -- its substance, relevance, and responsiveness to our leaders' needs. Because intelligence is secret and our Agency is closed to public scrutiny, I believe we must take the initiative to reach out to policymakers, the Congress, the private sector and critics and experts of all stripes for help in improving the substance of our work, our efficiency and our effectiveness.

- Second, I have spent a significant part of my career trying to build a dialogue between those of us in intelligence and the policymakers we serve. Intelligence must be relevant, timely, and responsive to the real requirements of the policymaker if it is to be useful and effective. And relevance can be insured only by a close, day to day working relationship. At the same time, intelligence must remain independent. Our very existence depends upon a reputation for integrity and for objectivity. Splendidly isolated, our independence is guaranteed but so is our irrelevance. While daily engagement with the policymaker requires constant vigilance and sound judgment to maintain our objectivity, this is the arena where we must operate. And constant contact is imperative.

- Third, my years on the National Security Council Staff opened my eyes to the enormous cost imposed on the effectiveness of government (including intelligence) by bureaucratic parochialism -- turf battles. As Deputy Director for Intelligence and Chairman of the National Intelligence Council, I have worked to break down institutional barriers inside CIA and within the Intelligence Community. Only by cooperation and by combining the strengths of each organization can we do our work effectively. The present harmony that characterizes the American Intelligence Community is due in significant measure to Director Casey's leadership in reducing these barriers, and I look forward to helping him make further progress in this area.

My career has been spent primarily on the overt side of CIA and, specifically, at that point where the product of our vast collection apparatus emerges in finished form to help warn and inform policymakers and to help them better understand a complex world. The pace of change is accelerating; challenges to our security and well being are multiplying; opportunities to promote our democratic values and to help others share our economic prosperity are increasing. The contribution of intelligence in discerning and explaining these developments is becoming more vital.

We are entering an era when demands on the Intelligence Community are reaching beyond traditional areas into new worlds including terrorism, narcotics, technology transfer, the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons and many other problems. We must find the resources to support these new efforts while continuing to place major emphasis on the collection and analysis of countries hostile to the United States.

Thanks to the rebuilding effort of the last several years and a policy community willing to work with us, the American

intelligence community in my view has never been in finer shape. Good intelligence is a wise and necessary investment. It can, and has, saved billions of dollars for the Department of Defense through information we acquire on Soviet weapons and military plans. Even more important, in analyzing, penetrating, and countering the shadowy worlds of terrorism, narcotics, subversion and other problems, we save lives and help protect the nation. But this investment in intelligence cannot be turned on and off like a faucet. It takes years to train a case officer or a good analyst, and often a decade or more to build a new technical collection system. Quality intelligence requires sustained support. We have come a long way back in recent years, but the challenges are multiplying and a continuing investment is required. Here, the understanding and support of the President and of the Oversight Committees have been invaluable.

In closing, a rare public hearing such as this requires acknowledgement of the brave men and women of American intelligence, military and civilian, who live and work in dangerous and inhospitable places overseas and under enormous pressures here at home. With courage and dedication, they endure personal sacrifice, incredibly long hours, a cloak of secrecy about what they do that excludes even their families, a lack of privacy, and yet anonymity. As the President said to some of them in 1984, "The work you do each day is essential to the survival and to the spread of human freedom. You remain the eyes and ears of the Free World. You are the tripwire" The nation can be proud of its intelligence corps and, if confirmed, I would be proud to serve with them as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I would be pleased to answer any questions that you or members of the Committee may wish to ask.